



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

liament was still binding upon offender and offended, and for its maintenance in America Chatham would continue a struggle almost hopeless.

Thus does the author harmonize Chatham's attitudes at various stages of this conflict. The political consistency of that statesman indeed he vindicates throughout against the criticism of Macaulay and Lecky. Between Chatham's political and economic views he finds on the contrary a want of harmony. A reformer in the political, Chatham was, in the economic sphere, like his Whig opponents, a mercantilist. Burke, oddly enough yet not inconsistently, disagreed on this point with his party, and developed within it more liberal economic views. Pitt, being forced to look elsewhere than to Chatham for an economic mentor, found this in Adam Smith who, in a work unsystematic in itself, expanded the teachings of Child, Davenant, Tucker and Hume into the new economic system based, in its philosophy, on Locke, Shaftesbury, and Newton. A discussion at large of this system and of that which it displaced is, in connection with the contemporary social and economic development of England, the theme of the third, concluding chapter. It closes with this observation: while the old Tories, out of opposition to the Whig aristocracy, made the first attack upon the old economic system, the theory of the new was first perfected by Whigs of the Burke school, amongst whom is Smith; but those theories were applied in practice by none of these; they were the complement, on the economic side, of Chatham's political system, and as such were they adopted and applied by the new Toryism founded by Chatham and called to power, when the loss of America had humbled the King and tempered his ambition, in the person of Chatham's son.

Dr. Salomon is an investigator, of independent judgment, who, in the effort to exhaust all available material, has pursued even single letters in private hands. There is in his work depth of thought and brilliance of idea: there is also a want of clearness enhanced by a style difficult and diffuse. That he has at points wandered somewhat far afield, he himself seems not altogether unconscious. His manifest purpose is not merely to narrate the incidents of Pitt's life, but to illustrate, by a political biography the rôle of Pitt in English history. The measure of his success is still uncertain. To estimate it by the portion of the work before us would be to judge a mansion by its threshold.

H. M. BOWMAN.

The French Revolution and Religious Reform. An Account of Ecclesiastical Legislation and its Influence in Affairs in France from 1789 to 1804. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxvii, 333.)

THE importance of the subject treated in this volume will be acknowledged by all students of the French Revolution. The Old Régime was so thoroughly ecclesiastical that it is a matter of some surprise that the fortunes of the French church should have so generally been treated as a secondary matter. Of late years this want has been remedied to a con-

siderable extent by French monographs, but Professor Sloane's work meets a want in the English literature dealing with the Revolution. We are, however, inclined to feel that he has obscured the real issue between ecclesiasticism and the party of "philosophy" when he says (p. ix) that "the mightiest obstructive force was ecclesiastical fanaticism both positive and negative"; for in order to justify this statement he is obliged to regard "the deism and the atheism of the 'philosophers' as religious forces for the purpose of our discussion." Fortunately, however, the confusion of definitions does not extend beyond the preface, and the book as a whole discusses the fortunes of the Ultramontane party and the non-juring priests under the various revolutionary governments.

Professor Sloane's sympathies are steadily with the church, even if not always with its representatives. Occasionally they lead him into rather turgid rhetoric if, indeed, not into an actual loss of historical impartiality. The burial of Voltaire marks a time when "the broad highway to blasphemy and scandal was thenceforth opened wide, and thousands thronged to enter it." After September, 1793, "the course of the sovereign assembly was a swift descent to hell, in which every type of extreme fanatic heathen took his turn at the helm and was swept into perdition to make room for another, until the engulfing maelstrom was reached and the faint hearted, shallow [lean and bilious, p. 199] Robespierre sounded the alarm" (p. 195).

Nor is Professor Sloane to be reckoned among those historians who attempt any serious appreciation of the Terrorists as political theorists or as administrators. The September Massacres he regards as (p. 190) "virtually legal," and "the pleas for the Convention so constantly reiterated" he holds to be "all alike pitiful—all except one: it was the incarnation of energy." The Convention was "revelling in political and religious massacre" and "gorging itself in the dismembered limbs of the social organism" (p. 196)—and this notwithstanding the statements of its accomplishments in page 225.

Yet if we are obliged to differ with the author's interpretation of the political side of the Revolution we cannot fail to appreciate his sympathy with the non-juring priests, his exposition of the motives and doings of ecclesiastical parties, and the nicety with which he estimates the actual influence of the church as an institution upon the course of events. Especially happy is his recognition of the complications arising from any dependence of the Church upon the State (p. 160) and his treatment of the indecision and insincerity shown by Louis XVI. in his treatment of the questions involved in the civil constitution of the clergy. Perhaps the most satisfactory treatment of the volume, however, is that accorded the Concordat. Whenever Professor Sloane touches upon Napoleon his treatment is firm and illuminating.

As a whole, despite a certain vagueness of arrangement, the volume is a serviceable addition to the literature of the Revolution. Less a narrative than a commentary upon facts assumed to be known, it brings

into truer perspective the potent ecclesiastical element in history which so many non-theological writers seem disposed to ignore.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

Robespierre: A Study. By HILAIRE BELLOC, B.A. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xiii, 387.)

FROM a literary point of view, Mr. Belloc has written a most attractive book. While not in sympathy with Robespierre, almost wishing, he tells us, when the work was done, "that instead of wandering in such a desert" it had been his task "to follow St. Just and the wars, and to revive the memories of forgotten valour," yet he has seized upon the essential traits of Robespierre's character and constructed a remarkably clear-cut portrait of the man. He has a keen sense for dramatic situations and knows how to make the most of them, not infrequently more than the evidence would seem to justify.

Artistically the work is a success; scientifically, I fear that it is not. Mr. Belloc realized "that such an attempt at vivid presentation carries with it a certain suspicion when it is applied to history," but added that the details that he had admitted could be "proved true from the witness of contemporaries or from the inference which their descriptions and the public records of the time permit one to draw" (p. xii). If this were really true, if all the details in the book rested on reliable evidence, the work would be as sound scientifically as it is attractive artistically. Unfortunately, it is not true. Mr. Belloc is more artist than historian. An exceedingly active subconscious imagination is not kept sufficiently under control. He takes the work of the historian too lightly, displaying a lack of patience and precision in the study of facts. That he "disclaims research," that he adds nothing to what Hamel has told us of the details of Robespierre's life, is in no wise discreditable, but none of these things justify inaccuracy. Mr. Belloc is inaccurate. I should hesitate to make use of any statement of fact contained in his book, before I had carefully verified it. Moreover, he either consciously states more than evidence permits, or he is unable to draw the line between fact and fiction. I shall cite but one example among many of the overstepping of the bounds between historical science and historical romance. After describing the origin of the Breton Club, Mr. Belloc writes: "This 'Brutus club' Robespierre of course joined. But he was not content with joining only. He was careful to be among its earliest arrivals, he was present at its least-attended meetings" (p. 81). Here are three affirmations; the first is a very questionable inference, the second and third pure fiction. (See Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins*, I., pp. ii-xviii.)

An excellent illustration of the inability of Mr. Belloc to handle evidence seriously is furnished by his treatment of the question of "Robespierre's Supposed Attempt at Suicide" (Appendix, note iii.). Compare his work with Aulard's treatment of the same subject (*Études et Leçons, Première Série*, pp. 282-300). Mr. Belloc evidently found his evidence in Aulard's study, but note how he has disfigured it in work-